

REMARKS

The objections under Section 112 have been cured by appropriate amendment.

The suggestion that Ethernet and Fast Ethernet are two different bus technologies should be reconsidered. Ethernet has nothing whatsoever to do with buses. It has to do with local area network access methods as defined by the IEEE.

Moreover, the cited reference does not indicate non-functionality of the onboard controller if the external component is not coupled to the system. Nothing in block 1114 of Figure 10 is to the contrary. All that this says is that the connection failed. It has no effect on the functionality of the alleged controller. The alleged integrated controller is a local device 100, according to the Examiner.

If the connection fails, the local device 100 (allegedly a processor-based device) is still fully functional and can operate unaffected by the failure to maintain the Ethernet connection. The Ethernet connection may fail and the Ethernet local device is fully functional.

Therefore, there would be no reason to indicate that because the connection failed the local device was non-functional. Nothing in the reference suggests the contrary. Therefore, on each of these grounds, reconsideration is requested.

Support for the amendment of claims 1 and 9 may be found, for example, at page 4, lines 21-23.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 19, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation